

Policy 1.1.3 Procedural Points and Processing of Development Requests

POLICY PURPOSE:

This policy suggests a way that development plans can be handled between the Planning Commission and City Council review. Also, it is the intent of this policy to establish better methods of communicating the City's concerns to the applicant in a timely fashion.

POLICY STATEMENT:

It is the policy of the City to provide for expeditious processing of development plans. Also, it is a desire of the City to communicate clearly to developers and to the public. The following attempts to provide procedural and processing formats to accomplish the City's policies.

Plans which are Approved or have a Potential for Approval

1. If the City Council wishes to approve the plans but requires minor to moderate changes not altering the basic request (e.g., roof line treatment), they can be delegated to staff or Planning Commission for final approval. The exact changes should be expressed in the conditions. The staff and Planning Commission will follow through with the applicant to assure that these changes in the plans are made.
2. Major changes which would alter the basic concept of the proposal (e.g., three stories to two stories; underground parking vs. at-grade parking) should be referred back to the Planning Commission with specific direction for change. Once the plans have been changed, given appropriate review by the Planning Commission and with a new staff report, they would return to the City Council. This rerouting through the Planning Commission may actually provide a shorter time frame for the applicant than starting from the beginning if "denied without prejudice." Planning Commission could also recommend to the City Council these major changes and rerouting to the Planning Commission.

Plans which are Denied

Projects whose basic idea or use is unacceptable should be denied. The message should be clear that the City Council does not want to approve the project in any form based on specific reasons. The plans should be denied based on specific findings.

Both Planning Commission and City Council should avoid the denial without prejudice route because it is confusing for both staff and the applicant. Also, if the concept is approvable there are other routes for review which can better meet the needs of the applicant and the City. These proposed measures should help to reduce confusing situations at Council (what plans are we really approving and what conditions?). The measure should also save time for the applicant.

(Adopted: RTC 84-488 (7/3/1984))

Lead Department: Community Development